Available online at www.sciencedirect.com
ScienceDirect
Nuclear Physics A 00 (2014) 1–4
Nuclear Physics A

The quark mass gap in strong magnetic fields

Toru Kojo[a], Nan Su[b]

[a]Department of Physics, University of Illinois, 1110 W. Green Street, Urbana, Illinois 61801
[b]Faculty of Physics, University of Bielefeld, D-33615 Bielefeld, Germany

arXiv:1407.7925v1 [hep-ph] 30 Jul 2014

Abstract

Quarks in strong magnetic fields ($|eB| \gg \Lambda_{\rm QCD}^2 \sim 0.04\,{\rm GeV}^2$) acquire enhanced infrared phase space proportional to $|eB|$. Accordingly they provide larger chiral condensates and stronger backreactions to the gluon dynamics. Confronting theories with lattice data at various values of $|eB|$, one can test theoretical ideas as well as validity of various approximations, domain of applicability of the effective models, and so on. The particularly interesting findings on the lattice are *inverse magnetic catalysis* and *linear growth of the chiral condensate as a function of* $|eB|$, which pose theoretical challenges. In this talk we propose a scenario to explain both phenomena, claiming that the quark mass gap should stay at around $\sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$, instead of $\sim |eB|^{1/2}$ which has been supposed from dimensional arguments and/or effective model calculations. The contrast between infrared and ultraviolet behaviors of the interaction is a key ingredient to obtain the mass gap of $\sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$.

Keywords: Strong magnetic fields, chiral symmetry breaking, Landau degeneracy

1. Motivations and theoretical problems

When uniform magnetic fields are applied to a certain direction (we choose the z-direction), quarks wrap around the magnetic field. Then the orbital motion of quarks in the transverse direction is quantized, leading to the discretized Landau levels (LLs). The splitting between each level is $\sim |eB|$. At tree level, the energy for a quark in the n-th Landau level is given by ($n = 0, 1, \cdots$) [1]

$$E_n(p_z) = \sqrt{p_z^2 + 2n|eB| + m^2}\ , \qquad (m : \text{quark mass}) \tag{1}$$

where the term $2n|eB|$ (we call it transverse energy) comes from the energies of the orbital motion and Zeeman effects. Each Landau level has a degeneracy factor $\sim |eB|$ with which total number of states remains the same for all B.

What makes QCD in magnetic fields particularly interesting is the lowest LL (LLL). Two aspects are essential in our arguments: (i) Quarks in the LLL have zero transverse energy and are indenpendent of B at tree level. They acquire the B-dependence only through interactions. (ii) For larger B, the zero transverse energy and Landau degeneracy together allow more quarks to stay at low energy. This enhances nonperturbative effects associated with quarks.

On the lattice we can study QCD at various values of B, controlling the size of the infrared phase space for quarks in the LLL. Such system can be regarded as a laboratory which is designed for the studies of the entanglement between quark and gluon dynamics, because gluons are affected by B only through the couplings to quarks. Such information would be helpful to understand the cold, dense QCD matter in which the largest uncertainties come from treatments of gluons [2]. These considerations greatly motivate the authors to study QCD at strong magnetic fields, $|eB| \gg \Lambda_{\rm QCD}^2$.

The lattice results at finite B pose very interesting theoretical problems which are qualitative rather than quantitative. In this talk we especially focus on two problems as the representatives: (i) *Inverse magnetic catalysis* [3]. The

(2+1) flavor lattice results for physical pion masses show that the critical temperatures (T_c) for the chiral restoration and deconfinement decrease as B increases, by $10-20\%$ at $|eB| \simeq 1\,\mathrm{GeV}^2$. Studies based on the chiral effective models and the QED-like treatments instead lead to increasing critical temperatures; (ii) *The B-dependence of chiral condensates* [4]. The effective models or chiral perturbation theories explain the data well at $|eB| \ll \Lambda_{\rm QCD}^2$, but beyond $|eB| \sim 0.1-0.3\,\mathrm{GeV}^2$, their predictions start to deviate from the lattice results in which the chiral condensate grows like $\sim |eB|\Lambda_{\rm QCD}$.

Below we shall argue how to identify the origin of the problems, and then give possible resolutions for it. A key issue will be on the estimate of the dynamically generated quark mass gap, M. While the estimate based on the dimensional ground or effective model calculations gives the mass gap of $\sim |eB|^{1/2}$ [1], we instead claim that the mass gap should be nearly B-independent and $\sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$, at least within the range of B studied on the lattice. Then we will outline how to get the mass gap of $\sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$ by analyzing the structure of the Schwinger-Dyson equation at finite B [5].

2. The problems in terms of the quark mass gap

We are going to phrase the problems in terms of the mass gap. First we discuss the B-dependence of the chiral condensate. In order to include the B effects to all orders for strong B fields, we use the Ritus bases for quarks in the LLs. With the Ritus bases, we get a formula ($p_L = (p_0, p_z)$, $\int_{p_L} \equiv \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^2 p_L}{(2\pi)^2}$) [1],

$$\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle_{\rm 4D} = \frac{|eB|}{2\pi}\,\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle_{\rm 2D}\,, \qquad \langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle_{\rm 2D} \equiv -\int_{p_L} \mathrm{tr}\left[S^{\rm 2D}_{\rm LLL}(p_L) + \sum_{n=1} S^{\rm 2D}_{\rm nLL}(p_L)\right]. \tag{2}$$

The $\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle_{\rm 4D}$ is the four-dimensional chiral condensate which is proportional to the Landau degeneracy factor $|eB|$. After the Landau quantization of the transverse motion, quarks in each LL only depend on p_L so that the propagator may be regarded as a two-dimensional one. We call the chiral condensate made of these two-dimensional propagators $\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle_{\rm 2D}$ for the bookkeeping purpose. The formula purely relies on the bases and remains valid even after interactions are included.

The propagators of higher LLs contain inverse powers of $|eB|$, so the leading B-dependence of $\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle_{\rm 2D}$ should be dominantly determined by the LLL. As already mentioned, the LLL acquires the B-dependence only through the interactions and therefore also for the case for the resulting dynamical mass gap. If the mass gap were $\sim |eB|^{1/2}$ as found in effective models, we would obtain $\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle_{\rm 2D} \sim |eB|^{1/2}$ (modulo logarithmic B-dependence), which in turn gives $\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle_{\rm 4D} \sim |eB|^{3/2}$, faster growth than the linear rising behavior found on the lattice. On the other hand, if we assume the mass gap to be $\sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$, we can get the desired behavior, $\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle_{\rm 4D} \sim |eB|\Lambda_{\rm QCD}$.

The size of the mass gap should also have a big impact on critical temperatures. Suppose the mass gap to be $\sim |eB|^{1/2}$ as suggested by typical effective model calculations. If quark excitations were such energetic, the Boltzmann factor would be $\sim \mathrm{e}^{-|eB|^{1/2}/T}$ for low-lying excitations, so that thermal quark fluctuations would not be activated until the termperature reaches $\sim |eB|^{1/2} (\gg \Lambda_{\rm QCD})$. Thus with this estimate of the mass gap, the critical temperatures grow like $\sim |eB|^{1/2}$ as B increases. This increasing behavior is exactly the opposite to the lattice results. Meanwhile, if we postulate the mass gap to be $\sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$, the Boltzmann factor stays at around $\sim \mathrm{e}^{-\Lambda_{\rm QCD}/T}$, with which we can expect the critical temperatures of $\sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$ as in the $B = 0$ case.

Provided that the Boltzmann factor remains the similar size as B increases, the reduction of T_c would not be so surprising. Having such almost B-independent Boltzmann factor, the major B-dependence appears in the number of possible thermal excitations with the energies below T. At finite B, the Landau degeneracy largely enhances the IR phase space so that the thermcal fluctuations at finite B may be bigger than those at $B = 0$. In our scenario, it is these enhanced thermal quark fluctuations that explain the reduction of T_c at finite B.

Besides the aforementioned problems, the estimate of $M \sim |eB|^{1/2}$ would cause troubles in explaining $10\%-30\%$ changes in the gluonic quantities (gluon condensates [7], string tensions [8], ...) at $|eB| \sim 1\,\mathrm{GeV}^2$ found on the lattice. Quarks with $M \sim |eB|^{1/2}$ are perhaps too massive to affect the gluon sector.

With all these considerations, we expect $M \sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$ instead of $M \sim |eB|^{1/2}$.

3. How to get the mass gap of $O(\Lambda_{\rm QCD})$

Having stated why the mass gap should be $O(\Lambda_{\rm QCD})$, we now consider how to get it. To compute the mass gap, we have to solve the Schwinger-Dyson equation. We include only the LLL because it is the dominant source for the dynamical generation of the mass gap. The contributions from the higher LLs can be safely omitted for $|eB| > 0.3\,{\rm GeV}^2$ [6].

The structure of the self-consistent equation for the LLL is given by

$$M(p_L) \sim \int_{q_L} S^{\rm 2D}_{\rm LLL}(p_L - q_L; M) \int_{q_\perp} {\rm e}^{-q_\perp^2/2|eB|}\, D_{\rm NP}(q_L, q_\perp)\,, \tag{3}$$

where $S^{\rm 2D}_{\rm LLL}$ is the two-dimensional quark propagator for the LLL. $D_{\rm NP}(q_L, q_\perp)$ represents interactions which convolute the nonperturbative gluon propagator and vertex. Here we have included possible dressing functions for the vertex into the definition of $D_{\rm NP}(q_L, q_\perp)$.

Several remarks are in order: (i) The propagator for the LLL depends on B only through the mass function M; (ii) The LLL propagator does not manifestly depend on $q_\perp$, so the integral equation could be factorized; (iii) In the quark-gluon vertex, there appears the form factor, ${\rm e}^{-q_\perp^2/2|eB|}$, because we are using the Ritus bases for quarks while the plane wave bases for gluons. The coupling between different bases yield matrix elements with the B-dependence incorporated [6].

Note that the B-dependence is introduced only through the form factor ${\rm e}^{-q_\perp^2/2|eB|}$ in the second integrand. Let us define the two-dimensional force,

$$D^{\rm 2D}_{\rm NP}(q_L; B) \equiv \int_{q_\perp} {\rm e}^{-q_\perp^2/2|eB|}\, D_{\rm NP}(q_L, q_\perp)\,, \tag{4}$$

which is the four-dimensional force smeared by the $q_\perp$-integration. The problem is now reduced to the examination of the two-dimensional force, because this is the only place where the B-dependence enters. Our goal is to explain with what kind of forces the B-dependence becomes very weak, leading to the estimate $M \sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$.

It is instructive to compare several forces. Let us begin with the contact interaction for which its strength remains constant from the IR to the UV regions. In this case the two-dimensional force and the resulting mass gap become

$$D^{\rm 2D}_{\rm contact} = \int_{q_\perp} {\rm e}^{-q_\perp^2/2|eB|}\, {\rm const.} \;\sim\; |eB| \quad\to\quad M_{\rm contact} \;\sim\; |eB|^{1/2}\,, \tag{5}$$

which are strongly B-dependent. This unwanted parametric behavior is typical for most of effective models.

For the QED-type forces proportional to $1/q^2$ (or the perturbative gluon propagator at fixed coupling), the B-dependence of two-dimensional force and of the resulting mass gap is considerably weakened [9],

$$D^{\rm 2D}_{\rm QED} = \int_{q_\perp} {\rm e}^{-q_\perp^2/2|eB|}\, \frac{\alpha_s}{q_L^2 + q_\perp^2} \;\sim\; \alpha_s \ln \frac{|eB|}{q_L^2} \quad\to\quad M_{\rm QED} \;\sim\; |eB|^{1/2}\, {\rm e}^{-O(1)/\alpha_s^{1/2}}\,, \tag{6}$$

where $\alpha_s \sim \alpha_s(|eB|)$. The expression for the mass is valid only when α_s is small[1], with which the mass gap becomes exponentially small. Note that the B-dependence of the two-dimensional forces is only logarithmic, and much weaker than the case of the contact interaction. To understand this, note that the form factor is activated when the size of $q_\perp^2$ becomes comparable to $|eB|$, otherwise it should be close to 1. But when $q_\perp^2$ reach $\sim |eB|$, the $1/q^2$ force already damps to $\sim 1/|eB|$. Hence, compared to the case of the contact interaction, the contributions from the region of $q_\perp^2 \sim |eB|$ become less important. Although the mass gap from the QED-type forces still has the marginal B-dependence and exponentially small, we are now closer to the desired solution.

Now suppose that $D_{\rm NP}$ in QCD has stronger IR enhancement than in the QED case. Separating the IR contributions from the UV contributions at some IR scale $\sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$, the two-dimensional force has two distinct contributions,

$$\left(\int_0^{\sim\Lambda^2_{\rm QCD}} + \int_{\sim\Lambda^2_{\rm QCD}}^{\infty}\right) {\rm d}q_\perp^2\, {\rm e}^{-q_\perp^2/2|eB|}\, D_{\rm NP}(q_L, q_\perp) \;\sim\; \int_0^{\sim\Lambda^2_{\rm QCD}} {\rm d}q_\perp^2\, D_{\rm NP}(q_L, q_\perp) + \delta f(p_L, B)\,. \tag{7}$$

[1] In the derivation one keeps only the logarithmic terms $\ln \alpha_s^{-1} \gg 1$ while drops off various $O(1)$ contributions.

Note that for the first integral in the RHS, we could make replacement, $e^{-q_\perp^2/2|eB|} \to 1$, for $\Lambda_{\rm QCD}^2/|eB| \ll 1$. In this way, the B-dependence disappears from the first term. On the other hand, the second term contains marginal B-dependence as seen in the QED case. But according to our assumption of the IR enhancement, the second term is negligible compared to the first term (unless B is extremely large[2]).

It should be noted that the more IR enhancement in the $D_{\rm NP}$, the less B-dependence in the resulting two-dimensional force. If the IR enhancement is large enough, the two-dimensional force depends upon B only weakly. Therefore the only relevant dimensionful scale in the Schwinger-Dyson equation is $\sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$, so that the resulting mass gap is $M \sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$. This is the desired result. Tthe recent studies of the Schwinger-Dyson equations with nonperturbative forces [10] are in line with the mechanism outlined here.

4. Conclusions

Strong magnetic fields nonperturbatively affect quark dynamics by enhancing the IR phase space for quarks. They provide larger chiral condensates and stronger backreactions to the gluon dynamics, whose qualitative behaviors are different from the predictions of the effective models for hadron phenomenology. These discrepancies should not be surprising because the magnetic field is much larger than the typical cutoff scale $\sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$ in the hadronic descriptions. In this strong field regime, proper effective models at finite B can be quite different from those at $B = 0$.

We have discussed the inverse magnetic catalysis and the B-dependence of the chiral condensate as the most clear-cut theoretical problems. The predictions based on effective models and calculations with perturbative gluons are qualitatively different from the lattice results. We attribute the origin of descrepancies to the size of the quark mass gap. We argued how to get the desired mass gap of $O(\Lambda_{\rm QCD})$ from the IR enhancement of the QCD forces.

While the regime $|eB| \gg \Lambda_{\rm QCD}^2$ itself is perhaps not directly applicable to the QCD phenomenology, such system can be utilized as an excellent theoretical laboratory. In particular, QCD at finite B has a lot of resemblance to QCD at finite quark density. We expect that concepts tested and devloped in QCD at finite B can be carried over into the dense QCD matter.

Acknowledgments

T.K.is supported in part by NSF Grants PHY09-69790 and PHY13-05891, and N.S. is by the Bielefeld Young Researcher's Fund.

References

[1] For review, I. A. Shovkovy, Lect. Notes Phys. **871** (2013) 13 [arXiv:1207.5081 [hep-ph]].
[2] D. H. Rischke, D. T. Son and M. A. Stephanov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** (2001) 062001 [hep-ph/0011379];
T. Kojo and G. Baym, arXiv:1404.1346 [hep-ph].
[3] G. S. Bali, F. Bruckmann, G. Endrodi, Z. Fodor, S. D. Katz, S. Krieg, A. Schafer and K. K. Szabo, JHEP **1202** (2012) 044 [arXiv:1111.4956 [hep-lat]].
[4] G. S. Bali, F. Bruckmann, G. Endrodi, Z. Fodor, S. D. Katz and A. Schafer, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 071502 [arXiv:1206.4205 [hep-lat]];
V. V. Braguta, P. V. Buividovich, T. Kalaydzhyan, S. V. Kuznetsov and M. I. Polikarpov, Phys. Atom. Nucl. **75** (2012) 488 [arXiv:1011.3795 [hep-lat]];
M. D'Elia and F. Negro, Phys. Rev. D **83** (2011) 114028 [arXiv:1103.2080 [hep-lat]].
[5] T. Kojo and N. Su, Phys. Lett. B **720** (2013) 192 [arXiv:1211.7318 [hep-ph]].
[6] T. Kojo and N. Su, Phys. Lett. B **726** (2013) 839 [arXiv:1305.4510 [hep-ph]].
[7] G. S. Bali, F. Bruckmann, G. Endrodi, F. Gruber and A. Schaefer, JHEP **1304** (2013) 130 [arXiv:1303.1328 [hep-lat]];
S. Ozaki, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 054022 [arXiv:1311.3137 [hep-ph]].
[8] C. Bonati, M. D'Elia, M. Mariti, M. Mesiti, F. Negro and F. Sanfilippo, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 114502 [arXiv:1403.6094 [hep-lat]].
[9] V. P. Gusynin, V. A. Miransky and I. A. Shovkovy, Nucl. Phys. B **462** (1996) 249 [hep-ph/9509320].
[10] P. Watson and H. Reinhardt, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 045008 [arXiv:1310.6050 [hep-ph]];
N. Mueller, J. A. Bonnet and C. S. Fischer, Phys. Rev. D **89** (2014) 094023 [arXiv:1401.1647 [hep-ph]].

[2]The UV contribution becomes important when $\Lambda_{\rm QCD} \sim |eB|^{1/2} e^{-O(1)/\alpha_s^{1/2}} \sim M_{\rm QED}$. This happens when the prefactor $|eB|^{1/2}$ becomes large enough to compensate the exponentially small factor. We should remember that the expression for $M_{\rm QED}$ is valid only for small α_s.